A F
T A

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application. No: 10/021,728 §	Examiner: Bayerl, Raymond J.
Filed: December 12, 2001 §	Group/Art Unit: 2173
Inventor(s): §	Atty. Dkt. No: 5150-54300
David W Fuller, Sundeep §	
Chandhoke, Nicolas Vazquez and §	
Christopher Cifra §	
§	
Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD §	
FOR PROVIDING §	
SUGGESTED §	
GRAPHICAL §	
PROGRAMMING §	
OPERATIONS §	
§	

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Jeffrey C. Hood

_____ _____
Signature   Date   12/13/2005

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir/Madam:

Further to the Examiner's Answer of November 9, 2005, Appellant presents this Reply Brief, and respectfully requests that this Reply Brief be considered by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

REMARKS

As the Examiner notes, claim 1 recites in part: "displaying one or more suggested nodes to include in the graphical program in a second palette, based on the one or more nodes selected by the user input".

Thus the suggested nodes are <u>suggested based on the nodes that the user has already selected</u>. The Sojoodi reference (which is of the same assignee as the present application) simply does not teach or suggest this. The cited portion of Sojoodi at col. 16 line 64 relates to a help screen of a single node describing the terminals (inputs and outputs) of that node, not a palette from which nodes can be selected. Further, this cited portion of Sojoodi makes no mention at all of suggested based on the nodes that the user has already selected. The Examiner's answer makes the statement that "Within such a 'second palette' will be 'nodes' that are most certainly the 'suggested' ones for the stage that follows first 'node' entry." There is absolutely no support for this, and further this statement simply misses the point. Claim 1 requires that nodes are suggested <u>based on nodes that the user has previously selected</u>. The Examiner's statement above does not address this limitation. In other words, there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion regarding a palette having suggested nodes, where the nodes are suggested based on nodes the user has previously selected.

VIII. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of the claims is erroneous, and reversal of Examiner's decision is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the reply brief fee, if any, and any other fees that may be due to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5150-54300/JCH. This Reply Brief is submitted with a return receipt postcard.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
Attorney for Appellant(s)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800

Date: _12/13/2005_ JCH